No. 297

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

29th October, 1947

NEWS-LETTER

CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICA

SUPPLEMENT

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES: ITS DOUBTS AND ITS FAITH

BY OLIVER TOMKINS

A MEETING IN THE ALBERT HALL convened a month ago by an organization called the "International Council for Christian Leadership", and presided over by Mr. Kenneth de Courcy, is said to have been attended by nearly nine thousand people. The large audience points to the existence of a widespread desire (compounded no doubt of a mixture of motives) for more effective Christian action in the present emergency. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the promoters of the meeting seem to have got off entirely on the wrong foot.

The very use of the phrase "Christian leadership" itself raises fundamental questions.[1] It has to be asked whether "leadership", more particularly when, as in this case, it means leadership in the political and economic fields, is a Christian idea. Christ drew a sharp distinction between the secular world, in which the great ones exercise authority, and the new order in which his disciples, following his own example, would be ministers and servants. When two of his disciples asked to be given positions of leadership in his Kingdom, he asked them whether they could drink the cup which he was about to drink.

The need for the right kind of Christian action is so urgent that it is a pity that the promoters of the Albert Hall meeting should have confused the issues by ignoring the results of so

[1] Even if the phrase is dropped from Mr. de Courcy's literature, our contention remains the same if the underlying idea is that a body of Christians shall give "a lead" in economic and political matters.

much sound Christian thinking in recent decades. There is wide agreement that when Christians turn their attention to the problems of the secular world they must do so clearly understanding that they have to get into the game and humbly and faithfully play their part in it, without claiming peculiar knowledge about secular affairs which enables them to give advice from a superior vantage point above the struggle. It is not only useless but foolish for Christians to put forward an economic proposition and claim for it that several thousands or even millions of Christians support it, if one competent economist could shoot it to pieces.

A MISTAKEN LEAD

The pertinence of these questions in this particular instance is made clear by the contents of a pamphlet *The World Crisis*, which was distributed after the meeting and contained, as the chairman announced, the " constructive proposals " which supporters were asked to endorse. The main proposal of the pamphlet is that Britain, America and the countries of Western Europe all need new sources of wealth, new markets, new expansion and a fresh flow of world trade, and that the solution of all these problems is to be found in the formation of an African Development Company, with a minimum capital of £500,000,000. If this really got going and were given a free hand, says the hopeful writer, probably " within two years most of our present difficulties would begin to find solution and within five years there would be a considerable prosperity ".

The main part of the document is devoted to a " survey " of African resources. The facts may be correct enough (they are said to come mainly from the Encyclopaedia Britannica), but stated without qualification even inaccuracy could not be more misleading. " It is hardly necessary to remind people that the natural resources of that land are gigantic," says the author, and area by area they are listed, giving an impression of unending unexploited riches. A careful study of available published material would have led the authors to a different view of what constitute the real facts about African natural resources, which are not lying about the land in ungarnered profusion. " The basic problem in increasing the wealth of the colonies," the *Economist*

says,[1] " is to find out which of their resources can be developed economically—a subject on which there is more guess-work than accurate knowledge at present—and then to produce the right instruments for production and training ". We come now to a different question. No one will question that it is a good thing that the resources of the African continent should be developed for the benefit of its inhabitants and of the world. But there are plenty of people to attend to that without " Christian leadership ". For Christians Africa should mean people rather than material resources. The questions which ought to exercise their minds are how the appalling dangers to men's lives and souls in a rapid exploitation of the wealth of Africa can be removed or mitigated and how the perilous temptations which are inseparable from contact between the strong and the weak, now taking place in Africa on a continental scale, can be successfully overcome. All their energies need to be directed to the tremendous task, of the size and complexity of which few people have as yet even an inkling, of creating the right human relations between the backward African races, which have been swept into the fierce currents of modern civilization, and the rest of the world.

The pamphlet in question certainly contains a paragraph in heavy type on the necessity of safe-guarding native interests. " It would be quite simple," says the author cheerfully, " for the governments concerned to devise and enforce adequate safeguards." Quite simple ! It is not the foreseen or foreseeable dangers which constitute the worst threat to the interests of the people of Africa. It is rather that when men set out primarily to exploit raw materials and produce a return on capital their minds are rarely alive to the far-off repercussions of their actions. Those who, as colonial administrators, missionaries, educationists, sociologists and the like, see and try to remedy the effects of " development " in past ages, will smile a little at this " quite simple ". But the pamphlet raises a doubt in our minds : is it that the authors of this plan think that it will be " quite simple " to look after all native interests—or is it that what they think of as " native interests " is something a very long way below what they would think of as " white interests " ? " We must not forget "

[1] December 21st, 1946.

(page 4) " that there is a social development in Europe which makes it almost certain it won't be long before it is impossible to find young people to go into deep coal-mining. This must be faced." So Africans are to do the dirty work for us? And furthermore, " in case of war, the Anglo-Saxon system couldn't be defended without a highly developed Africa." So Africans are to pour out their lives and treasure to defend the Anglo-Saxon world? When it is put out in the name of Christian leadership, there is only one thing to be said about this idea. It is not leadership and it is not Christian.

BRITISH POLICY IN AFRICA

We shall devote the remainder of our space in this News-Letter to a brief account of some of the main developments in British policy in Africa.[1] The best beginning is with the notable step taken in 1923, when in response to an initiative by the missionary societies in this country the Colonial Office decided to set up an Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. The formation of the Committee not only made it possible to enlist the help of outstanding British educators in the educational problems of Africa, but set a precedent for similar action in other fields and furnished an example to other Powers having responsibilities in Africa. Advisory committees on health and agriculture followed soon after and there are now additional committees on forestry, animal health, fisheries, labour and social welfare, co-operation and research.

The Advisory Committee on Education very quickly discovered that, whatever might seem desirable for the educational advancement of the African peoples, most of the territories were poor, and were inescapably caught in the vicious circle that they could not develop their potential resources without an improvement in the health, education and general efficiency of their population, and that the funds to make such social advance possible depended on economic development.

The Colonial Development Act of 1929 provided up to £1 million pounds a year for colonial projects. In 1940 Parliament decided that the fulfilment of the responsibilities of trusteeship

[1] Africa in this News-Letter is taken to mean Africa south of the Sahara and north of the Dominion of South Africa.

for dependent peoples demanded a new advance and that the British taxpayer must come to the aid of his less fortunate fellow-citizens. A new Colonial Development and Welfare Act provided for an annual expenditure of £5 million pounds to promote economic, social and educational progress, and £500,000 on research. In 1945 an amending act permitted the expenditure of £120 millions up to 1955, £17½ millions of which may be spent in any one year and £1 million a year on research.[1] The Colonial governments have been asked to submit ten-year plans and most of them have already done so. Allocations have been made for the development of railways, roads, ports, water supplies, land settlement, housing, nutrition schemes, public health, education, surveys, research and the training of members of the Colonial services, European and African.

In addition to this the Government announced in June of this year its intention of establishing a Colonial Development Corporation with borrowing powers up to a £100 million. This will operate on commercial principles and will have as its object the inauguration or assistance of enterprises in the colonies designed to increase their productive capacity.

Earlier in the year widespread interest had been aroused by the presentation to Parliament of a scheme for the mechanized production of ground-nuts in East Africa[2] as a means of remedying the world shortage of oils and fats. It is proposed to reclaim for the purpose over three million acres of land, mainly in Tanganyika but also partly in Northern Rhodesia, at present uninhabited or very sparsely inhabited, at a cost of over £25 million. It is proposed that the scheme should be carried out by a government-owned and government-financed corporation with a board of directors answerable to the Government but having the fullest scope for initiative. Until the necessary legislation has been passed and the Corporation set up the scheme will be launched and managed by the United Africa Company.

The scheme is the boldest and most comprehensive that has ever been attempted for the development of backward territories. Model villages with adequate health, educational and social

[1] Most of this sum is to come from Britain and part from certain reserves in the colonies themselves.

[2] Cmd. 7030 H.M. Stationery Office, 1s.

provisions are to be included. (The danger of the human dairy-farm here raises its head.) If the scheme succeeds, it is likely to have far-reaching effects elsewhere.

It may be doubted whether any measures short of bold economic planning on such lines will succeed in raising the standard of living of the African peasant. Sir Philip Mitchell, the Governor of Kenya, who served for twenty years in Tanganyika, and has an exceptional knowledge of African rural economy, has pointed out that from immemorial time primitive man has been able to support himself at the primitive level in two ways—as a nomadic pastoralist or as a small cultivator of shifting patches of land—and that both systems are exceedingly vulnerable to disaster from natural causes. He believes—and others agree with him—that primary production on African peasant plots is already on the decline and that, so far from there being prospects of a substantial increase, populations (which in some cases are growing) are going to find it increasingly difficult to support themselves at their present level. All African areas cultivated in small plots or grazed by flocks manifest the same characteristics of over-crowding, excessive pressure on the land, erosion and loss of fertility and a severe struggle to maintain the existing very inadequate standard of living.

In December of last year the Government issued a memorandum on Colonial Mining Policy,[1] laying down the principles which should govern the policy of colonial governments in mining matters. It is not possible in a brief letter to give more than examples of the fact-finding activities sponsored or assisted by the Colonial Office. One in a totally different field is the systematic survey of African languages in which other governments are also sharing through the agency of the International African Institute.

ANTI-IMPERIALISM

The idea that colonies are possessions, owned by an Imperial power which can do with them as it wills in its own interest is pretty well dead in this country, as the outpouring of the British taxpayer's money on long term schemes and in particular on education and health ought to show. But (as Mr. Creech Jones

[1] Colonial Policy, No. 206, H.M. Stationery Office.

recently acknowledged) from Moscow and from the United States alike come the old accusation of Imperialism. The passing, a fortnight ago in the Trusteeship Committee of U.N.O. by 25 votes to 23, of a resolution calling on colonial powers to place their colonies under trusteeship, may or may not affect future action by U.N.O. but indicates opinion among the smaller nations. It looks as though in many quarters there is a disposition to reject the whole principle of colonial government without proceeding to the equally important question what is good and what is bad colonial government. At present the British Government shows no signs of being deflected from the task into which money and energy are being poured by recrimination and argument elsewhere. The need of Africa, and of most of the colonies is so vast and varied that the Colonial Secretary could dispose to advantage of much larger sums for colonial development and welfare than those which Parliament has voted, considerable as these are. The only answer to all these arguments is a practical demonstration of what can be done by a government prepared to spend money and to send men to the service of the colonies.

There is however one body of criticism which is in a different category—that which comes from within Africa. The war has given an impetus to a rising tide of national feeling among Africans. One of the fruits of good education is to encourage in educated African men and women the desire to play a worthy part in the progress of their people, to lift the masses from their poverty, to shoulder the burdens of leadership themselves and to resent being treated as political infants and (and this is the most keenly felt) social inferiors by Europeans, however well-meaning. Along with this growth in responsible thinking and rightful pride, is a different kind of national feeling, feeling of hatred, brooding on past and present wrongs, using the press for invective. Such slogans as " workers and subject peoples of the world—unite ! " show what use may be made of a feeling which has come from within Africa but can readily be exploited from elsewhere.

There can be no happy evolution of Africa, but only increasing friction and deadlock, unless Africans are made to feel that their country will ultimately be their own, that it is administered in their interests, as much as in the interests of the world as a whole,

and that they will be trained so as to be able to take every opportunity of entering the service of their country. Increasing numbers of scholarships are being given to Africans from East, West and Central Africa to study in Great Britain, and this is evidence that colonial governments desire that Africans shall study the workings of democracy at first hand. Representatives of the people of Africa and of the West Indies now have a place in the Colonial Economic Development Council in London.

Of even greater importance in the long run are the advances being made in higher education. Plans are under way for the development of university colleges (to become later full universities) in the Gold Coast, at Ibadan in Nigeria and at Makerere in Uganda. The Gordon College in the Sudan will have a similar status. It is also proposed to develop to university status the schools of medicine, agriculture and forestry, which will serve the needs of West Africa as a whole, and similar developments are planned for East Africa. A special report on mass education has been published and the work of implementing it has begun.

No one can think seriously about higher education in Africa without being confronted by the fundamental question what new philosophy of life will provide spiritual foundations for the future of the African people. The insistent demands of a programme of economic development are in danger of pushing the question of ultimate beliefs into the background.[1] But if Europe is unable to give to the peoples of Africa some of the treasures of its heritage, its contact with that continent will not only have been stained by injustices and crimes, but will be without any historical meaning. This gift can be made chiefly by one means, through people, and here is scope for all the Christian leadership of which we are capable.

Kathleen Bliss

[1] cf. Bishop Bergmann on the effect of rapid economic development on higher education in Australia, C.N-L. Supplement 285.

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES: ITS DOUBTS AND ITS FAITH

By OLIVER TOMKINS

THE World Council of Churches faces a dangerous moment. It is about to be born. For nearly ten years all its official literature has been headed "World Council of Churches (in process of formation)". But the first Assembly in August, 1948, will remove the clause in brackets. The World Council ceases to be an idea and becomes a *fact*, with all the dangers that are implicit in that transition. Of course for something that does not exist the World Council has already been remarkably active. But all that exists is of a provisional character and the Assembly itself will have to decide what the nature of the future activities of the Council are to be, and to decide with whatever authority attaches to the officially appointed representatives of 126 churches met together for the express purpose of inaugurating this new experiment. The next ten months should see a considerable increase of knowledge and interest in the nature of the World Council's plans.

It is a long acknowledged weakness of the ecumenical movement (of which the World Council is only the most formal and most recent expression) that it has been too much confined to a relatively small handful of leaders who have been the actual participants. But this restriction of informed interest is not its only weakness. So great an experiment raises many qualms. I am particularly glad to be able frankly to face with readers of the C.N-L. some of the difficulties and doubts which are certainly felt. Although I write inevitably as a "civil servant" of the enterprise, I hope I shall be able to give expression to the active sense of self-criticism which Christian institutions should be able uniquely to exercise, although only too often they do not.

First let us be clear, though, that the setting up of the World Council of Churches *is* a great experiment. In spite of qualifications that I am going on to make, the fact remains that here we are faced with the creation of a new organ for co-operation between long separated Christians, on a bigger scale and with

greater potentialities than ever before. This is true, in spite of the crippling absence from its councils of the biggest of the Christian communions. Even without Rome, the Christianity the Council will represent in its member-churches is spread over the entire world to a degree which was not true, for example, of the early ecumenical Councils or of the mediaeval Conciliar movement. Although, "catholicity" has no necessary connection with geographical extent, this fact of geographical extent has its importance, not least because of the unpredictable possibilities which lie before the younger Churches in the developing cultures of Asia and Africa.

The ten years of its "process of formation" have shown some of the possibilities which the Council contains; the extensive work of Christian charity symbolized by the Reconstruction Department; the world-wide intellectual co-operation sponsored by the Study Department; the increasingly close association with the evangelistic work of the International Missionary Council and with younger Churches; the possibilities for Christian leadership of the Ecumenical Training Institute under Dr. Kraemer; and the desire of the Church youth organizations in many countries to make full use of the World Council's Youth Department. The Assembly itself will have to decide which of its provisional developments shall go further and whether new ones should be created, but it is already clear that the new organ that comes into existence next August has great possibilities. Over a wide field of its activities, no responsible person has any doubts about the World Council's purpose. For many concrete tasks of co-operation, for many things which churches can do better together than they could do in isolation, if the World Council had not already been proposed, it would be necessary to invent it.

But the Assembly will meet with many doubts in its mind about itself. There is only space here to outline some of those which I know to exist widely in the minds both of those who are wholly committed to the project in principle and of those who have yet to be convinced of its soundness. The best survey yet given both of the possibilities and of the difficulties of the Council is to be found in the report of the General Secretary to the recent meeting of the Provisional Committee in the United

States.[1] But this Supplement is both shorter than that report and is written more from the perspective of one who faces the prospect of Amsterdam from English soil.

The other great Christian conference of next summer, the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican bishops, provides instructive similarities and differences. The Lambeth Conference is 80 years old, though its normal ten-yearly sequence has twice been broken by world wars, and it represents a tradition which, in spite of divergencies that are the despair of its friends and the delight of its foes, has an unmistakable inner unity. The World Council Assembly is new, and although the last forty years of the ecumenical movement have revealed a unity which at its beginning was never suspected, the churches which will be represented at Amsterdam are often sharply divided. However, to bear in mind throughout this paper the similarities and differences between Lambeth and the Assembly may shed the light that often comes from regarding the unfamiliar in the light of the familiar.

AUTHORITY

The first doubt which many feel about the World Council is as to the nature of its authority. Here comparison with Lambeth is certainly illuminating up to a point. The Lambeth Conference has no legislative authority over the churches of the Anglican communion, in spite of the frequency with which Lambeth resolutions are quoted as though they were Church law. The authority of the Lambeth Conference is "purely moral and advisory". But here the resemblance ends, for Lambeth is the meeting together of the ecclesiastical leaders of one of the historic churches dispersed in a world-wide communion. It is composed of bishops in a Church which gives to bishops a high, though never closely defined, place in its conception of authority. Although Lambeth "resolutions" are not ecclesiastical law, they have a high moral authority within the communion to which they are addressed.

But any resolutions passed by the Assembly of the World Council will have no authority over the constituent churches

[1] See pages 43-58 of the Minutes of the Buck Hill Falls meeting, obtainable for 6s. from the London office of the World Council of Churches, 21 Bloomsbury Street, W.C. 1.

except such moral authority as the Christian conscience in the various churches willingly accords to them. The delegates to the Assembly will have no commonly agreed status in the constituency to which they speak, and in the constituent churches there is an extremely wide range of conceptions as to the nature of ecclesiastical authority. This is in fact a conception on which many churches are quite unclear within themselves, and possibly the existence of the Assembly may do something to help the churches themselves to clear their minds on the distinction, if any, between moral and ecclesiastical authority, to the great gain of all concerned. But as Article 4 of the World Council Constitution makes clear, the World Council of Churches itself "shall not legislate for the churches nor shall it act for them in any manner . . . except . . . as specified by the constituent churches".

"CHURCHES" AND "THE CHURCH"

Both Lambeth and the Assembly face the fact of Christian disunity. Lambeth will again, as it did in 1920 and 1930, have to pay attention to its relationships with other parts of divided Christendom, and so implicitly or explicitly will have to reveal something of the attitude of Anglicanism towards the problem of "the churches" and "the Church". The Assembly faces the far harder task of relating a self made up of churches, which differ on their interpretation of the Church, to that Church which they all profess in the Creed. There are deep disagreements between the constituent churches at this very point :—

(*a*) There is one church which because it identifies itself wholly with the one Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Creed has no dealings with the ecumenical movement.

(*b*) Other churches would identify certain of the churches which exist in history as co-terminous with the Church of faith. The problem is which ? Some would assert, for example, that the retention of the historic ministry of bishops is an essential ; others would maintain that the true Apostolic Succession is in the Apostolic doctrine and not in a ministry.

(*c*) Other churches would consider the *una sancta* of the Creed as something at present unrealized in history, though partially realized in varying degrees in the separated churches, and seek

for a unity, which will indeed be a gift of God and not the work of men, that may yet lie in the future.

(*d*) Other churches are content to leave the organic unity of the Church unrealized, since they believe the true Church to be an *invisible* Church, though such churches are almost as likely to be outside the ecumenical movement as the Church of Rome, though for a reason which stands at the opposite pole.

All these conflicting convictions are held, and rightly held, within the ranks of those who co-operate in the Council. Consequently, it often and inevitably happens that words are spoken or written by some who hold one of these views which cause difficulty to those who hold others. The essential point is that the World Council of Churches is not committed to any one of these views, but aims at being the place where the subject is discussed. The Council is certainly not in itself the re-united Church, it is not even in itself a scheme for reunion, but it is the place where the divine command to unity is continually faced in the conversation between separated churches.

PRONOUNCEMENTS

It is in the light of this " conversation " between the churches, in the context of the Council as a place where churches express a sense of responsibility for one another and for the world that we must see the question of whether the Assembly (or any other organ of the Council) should make pronouncements. Some believe that the stronger churches owe it to the weak and isolated ones to express publicly whatever common Christian convictions may be discovered; others hold that the Council ought to be " the voice of non-Roman Christendom ". The Provisional Committee last April issued a statement in which it said that " the Council . . . considers itself responsible to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, to seek to know the will of God upon important issues which radically affect the Church and Society, and thereafter, in the name of Christ, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, and in penitence and faith, to call upon churches, governments or men in general, as the situation may require, to deal with a given historical issue, in the name of Christ and in the light of God's revelation in Jesus Christ the Lord."

But there are many who question either the existence of such a responsibility or the wisdom of exercising it. The snares which beset ecclesiastical " pronouncements " are well known. Some of them may catch Lambeth as well as Amsterdam. Are big assemblies of busy men capable of formulating statements sufficiently concrete to be valuable? Are ecclesiastics competent to pronounce on the highly technical issues which lie behind every big problem? Are the compromises, to which every formula must be subjected to gain agreement, worth much when achieved? And who *are* these men, that their pronouncements should be listened to? If the World Council is to make pronouncements, it must try to give satisfying answers to such questions.

COMPREHENSIVENESS

The whole purpose of the World Council is to comprehend as many Christian bodies as possible. The issue is—at what price? For example, it is possible that Rome could be brought in if the World Council abandoned its present basis of being " a fellowship of churches which accept Jesus Christ as God and Saviour ", was prepared to drop all doctrinal discussion and all corporate worship, and to confine itself to being an organization for relief and practical co-operation on a basis of the Natural Law. Of course if it did that, other churches would at once leave it, and whatever might be the value of such an association it would not be all that the previous history of the ecumenical movement suggests that the World Council should become.

At a totally different level is the problem of the Orthodox Church of Russia and the Orthodox churches in countries within the Russian sphere of influence. World Council Provisional Committees have continually reaffirmed their desire to secure the full participation of *all* the Orthodox churches. The fact that the churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Greece, for example, are sending delegates to Amsterdam, and that the churches of the Balkans were represented at the conference leading up to the proposal for the World Council, suggests that the difficulties are due to political and not Orthodox scruples. The Russian Church of recent years has certainly enjoyed a relative liberty that it has not known for a long time; it is a liberty in which all Christians must rejoice and must do

nothing to imperil. But clearly it is a liberty held only on certain terms fixed by the Kremlin. In this the Russian Church differs from no other church in its dependence on the secular authorities. The difference lies in the nature of the terms. But how great a price ought the World Council to be prepared to pay to keep the door wide open for the entry into its ranks of the Russian Orthodox Church and of the churches which would follow its lead? The World Council, jointly with the International Missionary Council, has recently set up the Churches' Commission on International Affairs, and this provides an admirable illustration of something which might have to be abandoned or severely circumscribed if the Russian Church were to be expected to take a full part in the World Council's work.

But the Council has made, and continues to make, every effort, from its side, to overcome any difficulties which prevent the Slav Churches from co-operating.

At yet another level is the problem which has not as yet become actual, but which might become so at any moment. It might be illustrated by saying: Suppose the World Council of Churches had existed in 1937 and the so-called German Christian Church under Reich-Bishop Müller had applied for membership. That would have raised another problem in the comprehensiveness of the World Council. Can the constituent churches of the World Council, met in Assembly, designate another Christian body as an apostate church and refuse it their fellowship?

Certainly the World Council exists in order to be comprehensive, but it is not easy to see what price it should pay for its comprehensiveness.

BALANCE

Within the comprehensiveness of the World Council arises the further problem of keeping a balance between its constituent elements. It is essential for the Council's health that no one element should be allowed to overwhelm the others. This is well illustrated by two contrary criticisms which are sometimes heard on the provisional set-up, that it is dominated by continental theology (generally loosely described as "Barthianism") and that it is dominated by American ideology. It is true that the

spiritual gulf between the U.S.A. and Europe is as wide as the gulf in physical conditions. The World Council inevitably reflects this major division in the mind of the world (though the absence of the Russian Church means that it is not reflected in its harshest form). Probably no one who has seen the vigour of debate within World Council meetings between the continental and American viewpoints could assert that either is in fact dominated by the other, but it is foolish to pretend that the temptation does not exist.

A third charge should be mentioned here because it is not often heard in this country—that the dominant ideology in the ecumenical movement is the Anglican one. It probably has as much, and as little, truth in it as the former two.

Another aspect of the problem of balance can be summarized by the thought-confusing counters "Protestantism versus Catholicism". In view of the complete absence of the Church of Rome and of the strongest elements of Orthodoxy, in the light of the diminutive forces of the separated Eastern churches and of the Old Catholics, and of the divided testimony of Anglicanism, there is no denying that Protestantism has an enormous numerical preponderance. Actually those minorities which represent a more Catholic tradition within the ecumenical movement do exercise an influence out of all proportion to their size. So they should, because the harmony which the World Council seeks is not the suppressed discord of the majority vote. But the conflict is a real one, and neither side should abate their determination, if the World Council is to be healthy.

These are serious doubts indeed, and the task appears impossible. But those most deeply committed to the World Council are not unduly worried by the fact that their task looks impossible. They believe that they have been set the task by a Living God to whom all things are possible. "God is faithful who called you, and He will perform it."

Minimum Subscriptions—12s. 6d. ($3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year. 6s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 6d.; reduction for quantities.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—

THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1.

Published by Dr. J. H. Oldham for the Christian Frontier Council, and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press Cowley, Oxford.